

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
Sean Pak (Bar No. 219032)  
seanpak@quinnmanuel.com  
Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)  
melissabaily@quinnmanuel.com  
James Judah (Bar No. 257112)  
amesjudah@quinnmanuel.com  
Lindsay Cooper (Bar No. 287125)  
lindsaycooper@quinnmanuel.com  
Iman Lordgooei (Bar No. 251320)  
imanlordgooei@quinnmanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4788  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Marc Kaplan (*pro hac vice*)  
marckaplan@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Ste 2700  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

*Attorneys for GOOGLE LLC*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SONOS, INC.,

## Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant,

VS.

GOOGLE LLC,

## Defendant and Counter- Plaintiff.

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA  
Consolidated with Case No. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA

**GOOGLE LLC'S RESPONSE TO  
SONOS'S REPLY RE THE COURT'S  
REQUEST FOR FURTHER BRIEFING  
CONCERNING WRITTEN  
DESCRIPTION (DKT. 789)**

1 Google submits this short response to address a brand-new argument raised in Sonos's reply  
 2 brief (Dkt. 789, "Reply"), which was not raised in its prior summary judgment briefing nor in its  
 3 discovery responses. Despite having repeatedly argued at trial that "Party Mode" is ***not*** a "zone  
 4 scene" as claimed for a variety of reasons (e.g., Trial Tr. at 458:5-20 (Lambourne), 1659:19-1660:5  
 5 (Almeroth)), Sonos's Reply now contends that Figure 7 of the '885 and '966 Patents provides  
 6 written description support for overlapping zone scenes because it shows a user interface with "a  
 7 'Party Mode' zone scene and a 'Morning Wakeup' zone scene." Reply at 4. This last-minute  
 8 turnabout by Sonos, while potentially relevant to Google's invalidity arguments under Rule 50(a),  
 9 misses the mark in terms of the written description issue at hand. Figure 7 (left) and the ***entirety*** of  
 10 the specification's description of that figure (right) are reproduced below:



11  
 12 "FIG. 7 shows an example user  
 13 interface for invoking a zone scene."  
 14 ('885 patent at 4:4-5);

15  
 16 "FIG. 7 shows an example user  
 17 interface for invoking a zone scene. The  
 18 user interface of FIG. 7 shows a Zone  
 19 Menu that includes selectable  
 20 indications of zone scenes."  
 21 ('885 patent at 11:12-14).

22 Figure 7 and its accompanying descriptions fail as a matter of law to provide written  
 23 description support for overlapping zone scenes for at least the following reasons: *First*, Federal  
 24 Circuit authority makes clear that "novel aspects of the invention must be disclosed and ***not left to inference.***" *Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.*, 289 F.3d 1367, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002)  
 25 (emphasis added). Here, Figure 7 and its accompanying descriptions do not include any discussion  
 26 of the specific zone players in the "Party Mode" or "Morning Wakeup" zone scenes. Critically,  
 27 there is no mention of the zone players overlapping. Nor is there any disclosure in the specifications  
 28 that "Party Mode" in this figure comprises all the zone players in the home. In fact, the phrases

1 “Party Mode” and “Morning Wakeup” do not even appear in the patent outside of Figure 7 because  
 2 references to the “Party Mode” feature of the prior art Sonos 2005 system were omitted from the  
 3 provisional application and subsequently from the non-provisional applications. *See* Dkt. 785 at 3.

4       Although the prior art Sonos 2005 system included a “Party Mode” that consisted of all the  
 5 zone players in the home, as described by Dr. Schonfeld during trial as part of his *obviousness*  
 6 analysis taking into account the background knowledge of the prior art, the written description  
 7 requirement cannot be supplemented by the background knowledge of those skilled in the art—  
 8 instead, the test for adequate written description support looks only to the “four corners of the  
 9 specification.” *See, e.g., Rivera v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 857 F.3d 1315, 1319-23 (Fed. Cir. 2017)  
 10 (“Rivera argues that the background knowledge of those skilled in the art can supplement the  
 11 teaching in the specification to provide written description support. We reject Rivera’s argument.  
 12 As we explained in *Ariad*, the written description inquiry looks to ‘**the four corners of the**  
 13 **specification**’ to discern the extent to which the inventor(s) had possession of the invention as  
 14 broadly claimed.”) (citing *Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed. Cir.  
 15 2010) (*en banc*)) (emphasis added). Accordingly, since neither Figure 7 nor any disclosure in the  
 16 written specification describes the “Party Mode,” there is nothing within the “four corners of the  
 17 specification” that would inform those of ordinary skill in the art that Sonos was in possession of  
 18 overlapping zone scenes. Nor is it enough that “Party Mode” in the prior art Sonos 2005 system  
 19 rendered obvious overlapping zone scenes. *PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, 522 F.3d 1299,  
 20 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (“Obviousness simply is not enough; the subject matter must be disclosed to  
 21 establish possession.”); *Lockwood v. Am. Airlines*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“One  
 22 shows that one is ‘in possession’ of the invention by describing the invention, with all its claimed  
 23 limitations, not that which makes it obvious.”).

24       Second, an adequate written description requires “a description of an invention, **not an**  
 25 **indication of a result** that one might achieve if one made that invention.” *Regents of the Univ. of*  
*26 Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co., Inc.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (emphasis added); *Taylor v. Iancu*,  
 27 809 F. App’x 821, 824 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (a description that amounts to “a ‘mere wish or plan’ for  
 28 obtaining the claimed invention” fails the written description requirement). Even setting aside that

1 Figure 7 and its accompanying description do not disclose overlapping zone scenes, the disclosures  
 2 nevertheless cannot satisfy the written description requirement because they disclose, if anything,  
 3 merely a result, not any particular way of achieving that result. Indeed, Figure 7 simply shows “an  
 4 example user interface for invoking a zone scene.” ’885 patent at 4:4-5. It says nothing about how  
 5 to implement a system that creates, saves, and invokes *overlapping* zone scenes—again, leaving  
 6 that disclosure, at best, to inference. *See, e.g., Crown Operations Int'l*, 289 F.3d at 1380 (“novel  
 7 aspects of the invention must be disclosed and *not left to inference.*” (emphasis added)).

8 Even Sonos’s counsel argued at trial that Figure 7 relates to a different patent’s claims  
 9 directed to simultaneously displaying zone scenes, but does not say anything about *overlapping*  
 10 zone scenes. Trial Tr. at 1193:11-24 (Mr. Shea: “this was not talking about the claim language of  
 11 the patents in suit and the word ‘overlap’ or the discussion of overlap was not being discussed  
 12 specifically here. It was about simultaneous display”). Sonos also elicited the following testimony  
 13 from Mr. Lambourne regarding the “Party Mode” in his conception document (from which Figure  
 14 7 was copied): “For instance, Party Mode for somebody *might not be*: I want to play all the rooms  
 15 in the house. Maybe Party Mode for somebody is: I want to play in all the rooms *but not the baby's*  
 16 *room*, for instance.” Trial Tr. at 458:5-20 (emphasis added). Thus, per Mr. Lambourne, the Party  
 17 Mode in Figure 7 by itself (without taking into consideration background knowledge of the prior art  
 18 Sonos 2005 system) had no predefined set of zone players associated with it and, as such, could not  
 19 disclose overlapping zone scenes without additional information going beyond the “four corners of  
 20 the specification.”

21 In sum, the fact that Sonos now belatedly—and for the first time—relies on Figure 7 does  
 22 nothing more than confirm that there is a complete lack of written description support for  
 23 overlapping zone scenes.

24 Dated: June 2, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

25 /s/ Sean Pak  
 26 Attorneys for GOOGLE LLC

27 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
 28 SULLIVAN, LLP

*Counsel for Google LLC*

1                   **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2                   Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 5-1, I hereby certify  
3 that, on June 2, 2023, all counsel of record who have appeared in this case are being served with a  
4 copy of the foregoing via the Court's CM/ECF system.

5  
6                   DATED: June 2, 2023

7                   By: /s/ Sean Pak

---

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28